



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/750,923 | 01/02/2001 | Joel D. Tucciarone | 004-0003 | 7355 |
| 46064 | 7590 | 09/21/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| LAU & ASSOCIATES 7701 ROCKLEDGE COURT SPRINGFIELD, VA 22152 | | | RETTA, YEHDEGA | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3622 | |

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/750,923 | TUCCIARONE ET AL. <i>SM</i> |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Yehdega Retta | 3622 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to election filed June 6, 2004. Claims 1-53 are elected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological art; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the “progress of science and the useful arts” (i.e., the physical science as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For the process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

The independently claimed steps of making a request and entering a duration do not require structural interaction or mechanical intervention such that the invention falls within the technological arts permitting statutory patent protection. The claimed step of making a request and entering a duration does not apply, involve, use or advance the technological arts since all of

the recited steps can be performed in the mind of user or by use of a pencil and paper. Claims reciting those steps can be performed by interpersonal communications such that the claimed steps can be performed without a physical structure or mechanical object. The method only constitutes an idea for making a request for information.

As the technological arts recited in the preamble, mere recitation in the preamble (i.e., intended or field of use) or mere implications of employing a machine or article or manufacture to perform some or all of the recited steps does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise abstract idea unless there is positive recitation in the claim as a whole to breathe life and meaning into the preamble. Nothing in the body of the claim, recites any structure or functionality to suggest that a computer performs the recited steps. Therefore, the preamble is taken to merely recite a field of use.

Additionally, for a claimed invention to be statutory the claimed invention must produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. In the present case, claims 1, 3-53 the claimed invention does not produce useful and tangible result. Although the preamble recited requesting and collecting information, the claimed invention does result with collected information. The claim only recites requesting information which does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result, since claimed invention, as a whole, is not with the technological art as explained above and does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result, the claims are deemed to be directed to non-statutory matter. Nor does the recited steps of determining an amount of result, an actual duration, categorizing the action taken, inputting index, etc, provide the necessary physical transformation to render the claims statutory.

However in order to examine the claimed invention in light of the prior art, further rejections will be made on the assumption that those claims are statutorily permitted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 in the preamble recites a method of requesting and collecting information, however, the claimed method steps do not include the collecting of the information. Therefore, the claim is indefinite for failing to particularly point out the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 39 recites the limitation "specifying whether the search should be conducted". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 1 and 39 do not recite conducting search.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murphy et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,298,307.

Regarding claims 1-53, Murphy teaches making a request indicating a type of information; entering duration; receiving the information; a record to capture the request and result; analyzing the behavior of the requester; determining actual duration; taking an action based on the result ... Murphy teaches user preference database to record past activity of the user; determining the actual duration of the request ... (see col. 1 line 62 to col. 2 line 61, col. 3 line 40 to col. 4 line 41, col. 7 line 63 to col. 9 line 11 and col. 10 line 55 to col. 11 line 18, Fig. 5A).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chern et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,381,465.

Regarding claim 12, Murphy does not teach determining whether to issue electronic refund or coupon, it is taught in Chern (see fig. 15-17). Chern teaches alert message with advertising in order inform the consumer of promotion (see col. 13 lines 36-64). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to combine Murphy's event notifier with Chern's alert message with advertisement for the purpose of enticing consumer to take advantage of the promotional activity.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Walker et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,897,620, teaches sale of flight tickets.

Fox et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,742,127, teaches push server for sending notification to different wireless clients.

Marshall et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,650,429 teaches broadcasting message to recipients.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yehdega Retta whose telephone number is (703) 305-0436. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (703) 305-8469. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Yehdega Retta
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

YR